## Remarks

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 7-9 and 11-16 were rejected and claims 2-6, 10 and 17-20 were objected to. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 9 and 15 have been amended. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested. No new matter has been added.

## Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1 was rejected under § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,736,702 issued to Pickles (hereinafter "Pickles '702"). Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 2, which was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Consequently, the Applicant believes that this rejection has been overcome.

Claim 9 was rejected under § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,219,335 issued to Burridge (hereinafter "Burridge '335"). Applicant has amended claim 9 to recite a link that is "pivotally connected to a first window bracket at a second end." Burridge '335 does not disclose such a link. Instead, Burridge '335 discloses a "channel member 13 [called a first window bracket by the Examiner] to which a pair of horizontal guide members 14 [called link by the Examiner] are secured" (see column 2, lines 14-15 and Figure 2). Consequently, the Applicant believes that this rejection has been overcome.

## Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 7 and 8 were rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pickles '702 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,345,719 issued to Karwande (hereinafter "Karwande '719"). Claims 7 depends on claim 1. Claim 8 depends on claim 7. Consequently, the rejection of these claims is believed to be overcome for the reasons previously discussed.

Claims 11-14 were rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burridge '335 in view of Karwande '719. Claims 11-14 ultimately depend on claim 9. Consequently, the rejection of these claims is believed to be overcome for the reasons previously discussed.

S/N: 10/709,557 Reply to Office Action of October 3, 2006

Claim 15 was rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burridge '335 in view of Pickles '702. Applicant has amended claim 15 to recite a link that is "pivotally attached to the carriage at a first end and adapted to engage the window at a second end." Burridge '335 and Pickles '702 do not disclose or suggest the combination recited in amended claim 15. Burridge '335 discloses "a pair of horizontal guide members 14" [called a link by the Examiner] that each have "an upwardly projecting V-shaped flange" (see column 2, lines 14-18 and Figure 2). Each V-shaped flange projects "into a groove formed between head 15a of a stud 15 and a frusto-conical washer 16 mounted on the shank of the stud 15" (see column 2, lines 20-22). The studs are "secured to a window supporting member in the form of a Tshaped plate 17" [called a carriage by the Examiner] (see column 2, lines 23-24). The pair of horizontal guide members cannot pivot with respect to the T-shaped plate as they are both secured to channel member 13 and restricted from pivoting by the stude 15 that are fixedly positioned on the T-shaped plate (see Figure 1). Moreover, the T-shaped plate "cannot be rocked about an axis perpendicular to the plane of the window panel 10" (see column 3, lines 12-13). Pickles '702 does not cure the deficiencies of Burridge '335 since it does not disclose or remotely suggest a link or various other elements of claim 15. Consequently, the Applicant believes that this rejection has been overcome.

Claim 16 was rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burridge '335 in view of Pickles '702, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,640,022 issued to Kouth (hereinafter "Kouth '022"). Claim 16 depends on claim 15. Consequently, the rejection of this claim is believed to be overcome for the reasons previously discussed.

Atty Dkt No. 81099481 (FMC 1749 PUS)

S/N: 10/709,557

Reply to Office Action of October 3, 2006

## **Conclusion**

The Applicant has made a genuine effort to respond to the Examiner's objections and rejections in advancing the prosecution of this case. The Applicant believes all formal and substantive requirements for patentability have been met and that this case is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

**RICHARD LUBAWAY** 

Matthew M. Mietzel

Reg. No. 46,929

Attorney for Applicant

Date: December 5, 2006

**BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.** 

1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor Southfield, MI 48075-1238

Phone: 248-358-4400 Fax: 248-358-3351